

JS-6

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

KUM NAM LEE,)	NO. CV 22-03859 GW (KS)
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	
)	ORDER AND JUDGMENT OF DISMISSAL
PROLAND MANAGEMENT,)	
Defendant.)	


On June 3, 2022, Plaintiff, a California resident proceeding *pro se*, filed a civil rights complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (the “Complaint”). (Dkt. No. 1.) The Complaint is a single page suing Defendant Proland Management concerning a writ of attachment imposed on an asset of Plaintiff’s, and Plaintiff having a “low income or Section 8” application denied. (*Id.*)

At the outset, the Complaint violates Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and is subject to dismissal for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 8; *United States ex rel. Cafasso v. Gen. Dynamics C4 Sys., Inc.*, 637 F.3d 1047, 1059 (9th Cir. 2011) (complaint violates Rules 8 if a defendant would have difficulty understanding and responding to it).

1 Moreover, on June 6, 2022, the Court notified Plaintiff that Plaintiff had failed to pay
2 the filing fee and had not filed a request to proceed *in forma pauperis*. (Dkt. No. 2.) On June
3 21, 2022, 15 days after the Court notified Plaintiff about the filing fee, the Court ordered
4 Plaintiff to show cause, no later than July 5, 2022, why the action should not be dismissed for
5 failure to pay the filing fee or obtain authorization to proceed without prepayment of the fee
6 (“OSC”). (Dkt. No. 5.) The Court also expressly warned Plaintiff that his failure to timely
7 comply with the OSC “will result in a recommendation of dismissal of this case.” (*Id.* at 2.)
8


9 It has now been well over a month since the Court first notified Plaintiff that he had not
10 paid the filing fee. (Dkt. No. 2.) To date, Plaintiff has not responded to the OSC, paid the
11 filing fee, requested to proceed *in forma pauperis*, or made any contact with the Court aside
12 from indicating his intention to file a notice of appeal. (*See* Dkt. Nos. 4, 6, 7.) In light of the
13 foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that this action is DISMISSED.
14

15 DATED: July 21, 2022



16
17 GEORGE H. WU
18 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
19

20 Presented by:



21
22 KAREN L. STEVENSON
23 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
24
25
26
27
28